

Interview Summary

Application No.

09/656,769

Applicant(s)

ALBANESE ET AL.

Examiner

Ula C Ruddock

Art Unit

1771

All participants (applicant, applicant's representative, PTO personnel):

(1) Ula C Ruddock

(3) Martin Luksvirt

(2) Jennifer Boyd

(4) David Hawkins

Date of Interview: 10 January 2003.

Type: a) ☐ Telephonic b) ☐ Video Conference
c) ☒ Personal [copy given to: 1) ☐ applicant 2) ☒ applicant's representative]

Exhibit shown or demonstration conducted: d) ☒ Yes e) ☐ No.

If Yes, brief description: flat pile weatherstripping.

Claim(s) discussed: 1.

Identification of prior art discussed: Johnson et al..

Agreement with respect to the claims f) ☐ was reached. g) ☐ was not reached. h) ☒ N/A.

Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments: Applicant has discussed the differences between the claimed invention and Johnson's weatherstripping. Applicant's invention is a flat pile which is different from Johnson's.

(A fuller description, if necessary, and a copy of the amendments which the examiner agreed would render the claims allowable, if available, must be attached. Also, where no copy of the amendments that would render the claims allowable is available, a summary thereof must be attached.)

i) ☒ It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview (if box is checked).

Unless the paragraph above has been checked, THE FORMAL WRITTEN REPLY TO THE LAST OFFICE ACTION MUST INCLUDE THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. (See MPEP Section 713.04). If a reply to the last Office action has already been filed, APPLICANT IS GIVEN ONE MONTH FROM THIS INTERVIEW DATE TO FILE A STATEMENT OF THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. See Summary of Record of Interview requirements on reverse side or on attached sheet.

Examiner Note: You must sign this form unless it is an Attachment to a signed Office action.

Jennifer Boyd
Examiner's signature, if required